

PRINTER RUSH

(PTO ASSISTANCE)

Application : 10/667600 Examiner : Robert GAU : 3732
From : NPB Location : IDC FMF FDC Date : 05/06/05
Tracking # : 06090223 Week Date : 03/28/05

DOC CODE	DOC DATE	MISCELLANEOUS
<input type="checkbox"/> 1449		<input type="checkbox"/> Continuing Data
<input type="checkbox"/> IDS		<input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLM	<u>11/24/04</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Document Legibility
<input type="checkbox"/> IIFW		<input type="checkbox"/> Fees
<input type="checkbox"/> SRFW		<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> DRW		
<input type="checkbox"/> OATH		
<input type="checkbox"/> 312		
<input type="checkbox"/> SPEC		

[RUSH] MESSAGE:

In claim pages dated 11/24/04, renumbered claims 5, 6 and 7 (originally claims 7, 10 and 11, respectively) depends on claims 10 and 11 (originally claims 5 and 6, respectively).
Please advise/correct claim dependency.
yhuskyan

[XRUSH] RESPONSE:

Renumbered claims 5, 6 and 7 (originally claims 7, 10 and 11) are proper multiple dependent claims. While it is true that they depend from claims 10 and 11 (originally, claims 5 and 6, respectively), they also depend, in the alternative, from claim 4. Since claim 4 is the first claim in the sequence, claims 5, 6 and 7 (renumbered) depend therefrom. Therefore, the claim dependency and numbering is correct as set forth on the Issue Classification form already submitted.

INITIALS: OR

NOTE: This form will be included as part of the official USPTO record, with the Response document coded as XRUSH.

REV 10/04